

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claims 4, 5, 10 and 12 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 1 and 3 have been canceled herewith without prejudice. Moreover, new claims 23-26 have been added.

Support for the above amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment.

II. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) REJECTIONS

(i) Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6, 919,931 to Chae ("the Chae patent") in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,524,663 to Kelly et al. ("the Kelly patent") and U.S Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0124259A to Kodas et al. ("the Kodas publication").

In response, it is submitted that Chae, Kelly and/or Kodas alone or in combination each fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 4, 5, 10 and 12, as amended.

In particular, Chae, Kelly and Kodas are each completely silent regarding a method of manufacturing a thin film transistor array panel which includes forming an embossed surface of the protective layer, and a first contact hole exposing the drain electrode, a second contact hole exposing the gate pad and a third contact hole exposing the data pad in the protective layer using one photoresist pattern having a position-dependent thickness, as essentially recited in amended claims 4 and 5.

Moreover, Chae, Kelly and Kodas are each completely silent regarding a thin film transistor array panel, wherein the protective layer has an embossed surface and a contact hole formed by using one photoresist pattern having a position-dependent thickness, as essentially recited in amended claims 10 and 12.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 4, 5, 10 and 12 is requested for at least the reasons set forth above. As claims 6-9 and 16 depend from claim 4, claims 6, 7, 9, 17 and 18 depend from claim 5, claims 11, 19 and 20 depend from claim 10, and claims 21-22 depend from claim 12, withdrawal of the rejection to these dependent claims is likewise requested. Moreover, as new claims 23, 24, 25 and 26 depend from claims 4, 5, 10 and 12 respectively, these claims are likewise patentable over Chae, Kelly and Kodas for at least the reasons set forth above.

III. CONCLUSION:

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott L. Appelbaum
Reg. No. 41,587
Attorney for Applicant

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
Fax: (516) 692-8889